R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 255 SP 000 590

ORIENTATION HELD FOR NEW MEMBERS OF PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM.

BY- PORTER, NONA
WOMENS EDUCATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL UNION, BOSTON

PUB DATE 30 AUG 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.88 47P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PARTNERSHIP TEACHERS, *PART TIME TEACHING, TEACHER ORIENTATION, ORIENTATION MATERIALS, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, PILOT PROJECTS, TEACHER RECRUITMENT, *TEACHING PROGRAMS, BOSTON

TO DRAW ON THE UNTAPPED SUPPLY OF WOMEN, CERTIFIED FOR BUT NOT NOW TEACHING, WHO ARE AVAILABLE FOR PART-TIME WORK, A PARTNERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM WAS BEGUN IN A PILOT STUDY. EACH OF NINE PAIRS OF TEACHERS SHARED ONE FULL-TIME POSITION. A 1-DAY ORIENTATION MEETING FOR TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS PRECEDED ASSIGNMENT TO THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSROOM. AFTER 1 YEAR OF OPERATION, IT WAS FELT THAT THE TEACHERS WORKED EFFECTIVELY IN CURRICULUM PLANNING, IN STUDENT EVALUATION, AND IN PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES, AND THAT THEIR TEACHING PERFORMANCE EXCEEDED THAT OF A FULL-TIME TEACHER. FURTHER, UNDER THE PARTNERSHIP PLAN THE NEED FOR SUBSTITUTES IS REDUCED SINCE A PARTNER CAN SERVE A FULL DAY WHEN NECESSARY. (HA)

SP
000590

Q 10

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL UNION
264 Boylston Street, Boston

ED012255

Partnership Teaching Program
Mrs. Nona Porter, Director
Telephone: 536-5651
(Home: TR2-2393, Framingham)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FOR RELEASE: On or after Tuesday, August 30, 1966

ORIENTATION HELD FOR NEW MEMBERS OF PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM

The Partnership Teaching Program, offering unique opportunities for qualified women, has more than doubled in size this fall. There are now 50 participating teachers. The new members of the Program met at an Orientation Meeting at the Women's Educational and Industrial Union today (August 30, 1966).

Begun only a year ago, the Program arranges for two Partnership Teachers to split the responsibilities of a normally full-time teaching job. The novel concept solves the dilemma of women who wish to teach but are unable to do so full-time because of family responsibilities. At the same time, the plan provides schools with a source of talented instructors who otherwise would be lost to the teaching profession.

Some lessons from the Program's pilot year were passed on the the new members at the Tuesday meeting. Throughout the year, Partnership Teachers from the many metropolitan communities had met to compare and evaluate their experiences. At the meeting the results of these efforts were brought out in the three member panel discussion moderated by Mrs. Nona Porter, Director of the Partnership Teaching Program. Members of the panel were Mrs. Shirley Frant, Grade 5 Partnership Teacher, Waltham, Mass.; Mrs. Jean Kurtz, Grade 4 Partnership Teacher, Hingham, Mass.; and Mrs. Pamela McClain, Grade 1 Partnership Teacher, Framingham, Mass.

-more-

George King, Director of Elementary Education in Framingham, explained the role of Partnership Teaching from an administrative point of view. Mr. King was one of the first administrators involved in the Program. Also addressing the group was Miss Virginia Bullard, Director of Programs for Adult Women at Northeastern University. Miss Bullard is a member of the permanent Advisory Committee of the Partnership Teaching Program.

Attending the meeting, in preparation for their new positions, were Mrs. Dora Baker, 7 Gage Road, Cochituate; Mrs. Jean Barrett, 87 Tower Road, Marshfield; Mrs. Marie Bonello, 15 Day Street, Arlington; Mrs. Barbara Brackett, 54 Falmouth Street, Belmont; Mrs. Gladys Dratch, 68 Moreland Avenue, Lexington; Mrs. Elizabeth Dubois, 534 Ferry Street, Marshfield; Mrs. Marion Ewald, 46 Crestwood Drive, Framingham; Miss Dorothy Green, 75 Park Street, Brookline; Mrs. Frances Greene, 2 Clark Road, Bedford; Mrs. Mary Ann Hall, 47 Old Colony Way, Scituate; Mrs. Monique Kane, 38 Rolling Lane, Wayland; Mrs. Sandra Lerner, 7 Hyde Avenue, Newton; Mrs. Jean MacFadgen, 258 Parsonage Street, Marshfield; Mrs. Elaine Marks, 45 Woodmere Road, Framingham; Mrs. Virginia Page, 134 Lockland Avenue, Framingham; Mrs. Arlene Sallen, 43 Barney Hill Road, Wayland; Mrs. Carol Smelser, 27 Beulah Street, Framingham; Miss Lynn Smith, 17 Bigelow Street, Cambridge; Mrs. Margaret Veale, 12 Salem Street, Wakefield; and Mrs. Elizabeth Wood, 48 Damien Road, Wellesley Hills.

Under the Partnership Teaching Program, community interest in the new project has mushroomed. Framingham has increased their Partnership Teachers from four to ten this fall. New Partnerships have been placed in the immediate Boston area in Arlington, Watertown and Wayland. Placements have also spread to the outlying communities of Harvard, Marshfield and Wakefield. Inquiries have been received from as far away as California and Canada.

-30-

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL UNION
264 Boylston Street, Boston

Partnership Teaching Program
Mrs. Nona Porter, Director
Telephone: 536-5651
(Home: TR2-2393, Framingham)

FOR RELEASE: Immediately

PARTNERSHIP TEACHING ADVANTAGEOUS TO ALL

Partnership Teachers met Saturday, May 21 1966 at the Conference Room of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union for final evaluation of the Partnership Teaching Program.

Concensus was that the Program has been effective, efficient and advantageous to both the school systems and the women involved in the Program.

The Partnership Teaching Program has placed twenty-nine women in partnership or part-time positions this year. Partnerships consist of two women sharing one full-time teaching position. At the present time the Program is placing partnerships for next year.

Miss Ruth Bean, Executive Director of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, welcomed the Partnership Teachers and expressed her thanks to them for making the Program a success.

Program Director, Mrs. Nona Porter, told the group that "since the rehiring of the partnerships was to be the final evaluation of success, there is no doubt that we have succeeded".

Mrs. Gertrude Pearlman, of Boston, one of the part-time history teachers, pointed out that Partnership Teaching on the secondary level allows the teacher an opportunity to spend as much time in preparation and correction for 68 students as a full-time teacher spends for 180 students.

-more-

Mrs. Marcia Rivin, an elementary Partnership Teacher in Framingham, said that sharing observations of the children is a great advantage.

Attending the meeting were Mrs. Geraldine Cleary and Mrs. Pamela McClain, Grade 1, Hastings School, Framingham, Mass.; Mrs. Marcia Rivin, Grade 4, Roosevelt School, Framingham, Mass.; Mrs. Jean Kurtz and Mrs. Regina McDonough, Grade 4, South School, Hingham, Mass.; Mrs. Sylvia Feldman and Mrs. Betty Gilmer, Mathematics and General Science, Brooks School, Lincoln, Mass.; Mrs. Caroline Courts and Mrs. Marjorie Nelson, Grade 2, Norton Elementary School, Norton, Mass.; Mrs. Shirley Frant and Mrs. Lois Sockol, Grade 5, Thomas Hill School, Waltham, Mass.; Mrs. Maureen Oates, Physical Science, Concord High School, Concord, Mass.; Mrs. Gertrude Pearlman, History, Brookline High School, Brookline, Mass.; Mrs. Carol Rosen, Social Studies, Newton High School, Newton, Mass.; Miss Ruth Volkmann, Elementary Art, Hingham Public Schools, Hingham, Mass.; and Mrs. Betsy Wells, Remedial Reading, Brooks School, Lincoln, Mass.

School systems participating this year in Partnership Teaching are Canton, Framingham, Hingham, Lincoln, Newton, Norton, Waltham, and Westford.

Any women interested in Partnership Teaching are invited to apply to the Partnership Teaching Program, Women's Educational and Industrial Union, 264 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

-30-

PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM
Women's Educational & Industrial Union

Evaluation Meeting for Teachers
May 21, 1966

I. Special Problems

A. Substitute Pay - Should partners be paid for substituting for each other?

1. As a professional, a partnership teacher should have the same considerations as a full-time teacher; this includes substitute pay.

2. Partners should be able to substitute for each other without pay in certain circumstances where it allows minor flexibility (i.e., one partner covering for an extra half hour or so if the other partner is unavoidably detained).

B. Professional Organizations - Should the membership be split or should each partner have full membership?

1. The type of membership taken could depend on the school; some principals may have stronger feelings than others about the importance of full membership.

2. The Program feels that everybody (both partners?) should join if there is any question.

C. Partnership Teaching Program Interview Sheet - Do you have any suggestions or revisions for the interview guide sheet?

1. Ask the applicant about the number, age, sex of her children, and the kind of house that she has (easy to keep up?). If she has small children, ask her if she will have afternoon hours free for lesson preparation which will give her some extra time in the evening to spend with her husband.

2. The interviewer should be as sure as possible that the applicant has carefully thought out her home obligations and has anticipated any problems.

3. If the applicant is a secondary level teacher, she should be warned about the possible amount of extra time involved in her part-time position (meetings, dances, curriculum, teaching extra classes, etc.). She should understand that a half time position, with extra duties added, can amount to a three-quarter time position. She should discuss these extra duties with the principal during her first interview.

II. Personal Adjustments

A. Will you stay long enough to justify the school systems investment in you?

1. The school system can benefit from the partnership arrangement. On a part-time schedule women are being trained into the system. If they eventually go into full-time work they will be up to date.

2. Partnership Teachers can switch curriculum after a few years so that both teachers will have an opportunity to teach all subjects.

B. Do you take home problems on to the job?

1. No - Partnership Teachers try to be fully there in both situations.

2. Partnership Teachers who have experienced home difficulties (i.e., family sickness, etc.) find that teaching is so involving and demanding that it doesn't give them the opportunity to be concerned about home problems while they are in school.

C. Is there any conflict between home and school duties?

1. There is no greater conflict for a Partnership Teacher than any other teacher, full or part-time.

2. In Partnership Teaching there is an advantage because one partner can cover for the other if a serious conflict does arise.

D. Has there been a problem with partnership absenteeism?

1. No - There has been no problem with absence records for any Partnership Teacher.

III. Problem Children - Are they being dealt with effectively?

A. Are they getting enough extra help?

1. In some cases it is difficult for the a.m. teacher to return to give extra help. If this is the case, other arrangements have to be made.

2. On the secondary level, students must make a special effort to arrange extra-help time for the hours when the Partnership or part-time teacher is in the school. Extra help is of prime importance and it may be necessary for students to occasionally give up a non-academic activity in order to get extra help.

3. On the secondary level, the students benefit because a part-time teacher has half as many students, papers, etc. and is able to give more individualized attention.

4. On the elementary level, students are getting more extra help because there are two teachers covering one group of students.

5. Sharing observations is a great advantage (particularly on the elementary level).

6. If it is necessary to make an important decision about a problem child (i.e., should he be kept in a regular class or put in a special class, etc.), two opinions may carry more weight than one (with fellow teachers, administrators, parents, etc.).

B. Discipline - Have you ever had to pass discipline problems on to your partner?

1. Partners do their own disciplining but they pass on information about any trouble that is developing.

IV. Scheduling

A. Has the division of work been satisfactory?

1. From the first year's experience most of the partnerships have found that the lunch period is the best time to break.

2. Partnerships who have made the break at other times find it has been awkward.

B. Can the children do academic subjects successfully in the p.m.?

1. Reading is best in the a.m. and math can be scheduled for the first period after lunch.

2. The a.m. teacher on a part-time schedule may be pacing differently than a full-time teacher would in the a.m. Because of this, the p.m. teacher should watch for signs of fatigue.

3. The p.m. teacher would be wise not to start anything new in the latter part of the afternoon.

C. Are there specific problems for the a.m. teacher? for the p.m. teacher?

1. The a.m. teacher has the problem of not having the room available

to prepare for the next day. In one partnership the a.m. teacher uses the recess period to prepare her materials for the next day.

2. The partnership should arrange the change-over from one partner to another so that both teachers are not in the classroom during teaching time because it is too distracting.

D. Are there any specific curriculum planning problems?

1. There have been no problems. If there is any unfinished work it can be carried over to the next day.

E. Have you both been available for emergency meetings?

1. Yes

V. Communication

A. Communication with faculty - Do you get to know them as well?

1. The degree to which a part-time teacher gets to know the faculty depends on the size and physical set up of the school, the teacher's schedule (is she there for lunch with the other teachers?) and the teacher's individual personality.

2. Partnership and part-time teachers have been able to get to know the other teachers in the area around their classroom, but there can be a problem getting to know the whole department.

3. Partnership and part-time teachers should go out of their way to get acquainted with other teachers. Good communication with the other teachers in the school is particularly necessary if there are any resentments or misconceptions building up about the part-time schedule.

B. Communication with each other- Are the overlap periods and telephone conversations satisfactory?

1. One Partnership Teacher felt that there was less correlation in Partnership Teaching than in full-time teaching. (She also noted that she has not taught full-time.)

2. The elementary Partnership Teachers generally agreed that there had been less need to communicate by phone each night as the year progressed.

3. One Partnership Teacher on the secondary level exchanged classes for about three weeks with other teachers in her department. In this way she felt she had become more involved with the school because she had become acquainted with more children and with other teaching methods.

C. Are there really two perspectives in marking or do you agree with one another?

1. Some children have problems only in one teacher's subjects.

2. It is possible that with two teachers there may be a balancing of any predjudices that may exist.

D. Do both of you participate in extra trips and activities?

1. The Partnership Teachers who have arranged special trips have gone together.

E. Do you see parents together or separately?

1. On matters of discipline the partners see parents together, to discuss their individual subjects they see parents separately.

F. What is the parents' attitude toward you as a part-time or Partnership Teacher?

1. It is important to plan a meeting with parents during the first week of school so that they can get acquainted with the idea of Partnership Teaching and the two teachers.

2. Parents of first graders may need special treatment as they are apt to be jittery about their child going into a new situation.

3. If a school system sends out a summer letter to parents, an explanation of Partnership Teaching might be included.

G. How has the faculty reacted to part-time and Partnership Teachers?

1. It is very important for the principal to introduce the partnership to the rest of the faculty at the beginning of the year.

2. Public relations work should be done on the secondary level. (The full-time teachers may feel threatened if somebody on a part-time schedule is doing a better job.) Also, part-time teachers are often considered a matter of expedience on the secondary level, and those on full-time can feel that those on part-time are less willing to do paper work, etc.

3. Partnership Teachers should be modest about publicity and explain that it is necessary for the Program. (In one school the full-time teachers were resentful when the Partnership received publicity. This, of course, can also happen when a full-time teacher receives publicity and his colleagues don't.)

3. The Program's association with the Carnegie Corporation has made a good impression on the other teachers and parents.

VI. Are extra talents available to the school?

A. Yes. (One Partnership Teacher has been asked by her colleagues to take over the entire music program at her grade level in her school.)

VII. General Questions

A. How much time do you really put in on your part-time job?

1. The part-time and Partnership Teachers generally agreed that a half-time position equals three-quarters time work.

2. As much time is spent in preparing for half-time as would be spent in preparing for full-time (the children are being spoiled).

B. Are there advantages in partnership or part-time work?

1. There is more time for correcting so that tests can be given more often.

2. A part-time schedule can aid a teacher professionally. There is more time to take courses and do extra reading. (Maybe even a mediocre teacher can improve with a smaller work load.)

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL UNION
264 Boylston Street, Boston

date? 1965?

Partnership Teaching Program
Mrs. Nona Porter, Director
Telephone: 536-5651
(Home: TR2-2393, Framingham)

FOR RELEASE: Immediate

PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM ORIENTATION DAY

An Orientation Program for the first eight partnerships to be placed in Massachusetts Schools this year was held recently at the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, 264 Boylston Street, Boston.

Speaking at the meeting was George King, Director of Elementary Instruction, Framingham Public Schools, and panelists Eugene M. Hayes, Principal, North Middle School, Westford, Mass.; Robert L. Luther, Principal, South Elementary School, Hingham, Mass.; and John Stefani, Principal, Norton Elementary School, Norton, Mass. Also speaking was Mrs. Alice Kimball Smith, Director, Radcliffe Seminars, Radcliffe Institute for Independent Study. Miss Ruth Bean, Executive Director, Women's Educational and Industrial Union, and Mrs. Nona Porter, Director, Partnership Teaching Program also addressed the partnerships and principals.

The eight partnerships placed represent sixteen women who are now sharing classrooms as partners. They are all women who were carefully screened and selected for a pilot program seeking to demonstrate that there are many highly qualified, experienced women who will return to teaching if they can do so on a part-time basis.

In Partnership Teaching two women assume a full time teaching position. One woman takes the a.m. session and the other, the p.m.

-more-

The purpose of the Orientation is to enable the Partnership Teachers to discuss and anticipate the challenges that Partnership Teaching will offer.

Participating school systems are Canton, Framingham, Hingham, Lincoln, Newton, Norton, Waltham, and Westford.

The eight partnerships representing sixteen teachers are Mrs. Helen Gold, 58 Robbins Street, Avon, Mass. and Mrs. Estelle Katz, 56 Cochato Park, Randolph, Mass.; Mrs. Marcia Rivin, 4 Woodward Road, Framingham, Mass. and Mrs. Janet Sullivan, 182 Edgewater Drive, Framingham, Mass.; Mrs. Jean Kurtz, 34 Independence Lane, Hingham, Mass. and Mrs. Regina McDonough, 24 Bel Air Road, Hingham, Mass.; Mrs. Sylvia Feldman, 28 Bobolink Road, Wellesley, Mass. and Mrs. Betty Gilmer, 18 Haven Road, Wellesley, Mass.; Mrs. Mildred Grosser, 101 Upland Road, Cambridge, Mass. and Mrs. Jacqueline Marton, 35 Magnolia Avenue, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. Caroline Courts, Hancock Street, Plainville, Mass. and Mrs. Marjorie Nelson, 121 Nilsson Street, Brockton, Mass.; Mrs. Shirley Frant, 48 Blake Street, Newtonville, Mass. and Mrs. Lois Sockol, 39 Pine Street, Newton Centre, Mass.; and Mrs. Jacqueline Mills, 45 Mystic Valley Parkway, Winchester, Mass. and Mrs. Judy Zyfers, 27 Hubbard Street, Concord, Mass.

The Partnership Teaching Program was created by the Women's Educational and Industrial Union and supported through funds granted by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Committee of the Permanent Charity Fund, Inc. (of Boston). The "Union" founded in 1877 is a non-profit social service organization dedicated to the needs of the community and specifically to the advancement of the educational, industrial, and social development of women.

-30-

Date?

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL UNION
264 Boylston Street, Boston

1965?

Partnership Teaching Program
Mrs. Nona Porter, Director
Telephone: 536-5651
(Home: TR2-2393, Framingham)

FOR RELEASE: Immediately

PRINCIPALS MEET TO EVALUATE PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM

A ramdom sampling of parents of first graders in the Partnership Teaching class at the Hastings School in Framingham has shown a favorable reaction to the new co-operative Partnership Teaching technique. Mr. Joseph Schmidt, Principal of Hastings School in Framingham, reported the results of his informal survey at a recent principals' evaluation meeting held by the Partnership Teaching Program at the Women's Educational and Industrial Union in Boston.

Also attending the meeting were Mr. John Dadonna, Principal, Thomas Hill School, Waltham, Mass.; Mr. George King, Director of Elementary Instruction, Framingham, Mass.; Mr. Robert Luther, Principal, South School, Hingham, Mass.; Mr. Timothy Rhodes, Principal, Brooks School, Lincoln, Mass.; Miss Nancy Robinson, Principal, Roosevelt School, Framingham, Mass.; and Mr. John Stefani, Principal, Norton Elementary School, Norton, Mass. The meeting was held to evaluate the Partnership Teaching Program to date and to set up criteria for the future.

The principals agreed that Partnership Teachers are highly motivated and offer real advantages to the school. Mr. Timothy Rhodes, Principal of the Brooks School in Lincoln, said that he felt planning is better because Partnership Teachers spend as much time planning for their half day as full-time teachers do for a full day. Mr. John Dadonna, Principal of the Thomas Hill School in Waltham, mentioned

-more-

that absenteeism among Partnership Teachers is lower than with regular teachers.

Mrs. Nona Porter, Director of the Program, reported that "all the Partnership Teachers are convinced of the value of the partnership arrangement, both for the students and for themselves. The most important purpose of the Program appears to have been achieved; that is, reactivating the talented, prematurely retired teacher." Mrs. Porter read a letter from Mr. Wayne Altree, Head of the Social Studies Department, Newton High Schools, thanking the Partnership Teaching Program for the great aid offered Newton in finding teachers for their staff. Mr. Altree wrote, "I hope that your project can become a permanent program in Boston and that we can resort to you in the future."

The Partnership Teaching Program is a pilot program sponsored by the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston and supported by funds from the Committee of the Permanent Charity Fund (of Boston) and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The Program, which is in its first year, has placed nine partnerships in eight Massachusetts school systems on both the elementary and secondary levels. In a partnership arrangement two teachers share the responsibility for a full teaching load. One teacher takes the morning session; the other, the afternoon session. The Union plans to expand the Program for the 1966-67 school year. Any interested teacher or principal should contact Mrs. Nona Porter, Partnership Teaching Program, Women's Educational and Industrial Union, 264 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

-30-

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL UNION

264 Boylston Street, Boston

Partnership Teaching Program
Mrs. Nona Porter, Director
Telephone: 536-5651
(Home: TR"-2393, Framingham)

FOR RELEASE: Immediately

MEETING HELD FOR PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1966?

The Advisory Committee of the Partnership Teaching Program met in January at the Women's Educational and Industrial Union to discuss the progress of the Program to date and consider future possibilities for Partnership Teaching. The meeting was conducted by Mrs. Nona Porter, Director of the Partnership Teaching Program. Attending were: Miss Virginia Bullard, Director, Programs for Adult Women, Northeastern University; Mrs. Katharine Davis, Director of Continuing Education, Simmons College; Dr. Richard H. Goodman, Executive Secretary, The New England School Development Council; Dr. Kenneth Myron Greene, Director, School of Education, Simmons College; Dr. Francis X. Guindon, Assistant Director, Division of State Colleges, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Dr. Frank E. Marsh, Jr., Acting Dean of Education, Northeastern University; Dr. Richard Schettler, Director of Field Experiences, Boston University School of Education; Dr. Alice Kimball Smith, Director, Radcliffe Seminars, Radcliffe Institute for Independent Study; Dr. C. Burleigh Wellington, Director of Student Teaching and Teacher Placement, Tufts University; Mr. Joseph Young, Assistant Dean, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University; and Miss Ruth Bean, Executive Director, Women's Educational and Industrial Union.

The Partnership Teaching Program, sponsored by the Women's Educational and

-more-

Industrial Union, has been in operation for a year and has placed nine partnerships in eight Massachusetts school systems: Canton, Framingham, Hingham, Lincoln, Newton, Norton, Waltham, and Westford. The two teachers in a partnership divide a regular full-time schedule, giving each teacher an opportunity to work part-time.

Opening the meeting, Mrs. Porter summarized the Program's development in its pilot year. She stressed the value of the exploration of this co-operative teaching technique. "In a partnership arrangement," Mrs. Porter said, "the schools obtain two teachers who are experienced, skilled, and highly motivated. These are teachers who cannot teach full-time because of family responsibilities, but are extremely interested in keeping active and up-to-date in their profession."

Plans for expanding the Program for the 1966-1967 school year were discussed at the meeting. The "Union" hopes to introduce the advantages of Partnership Teaching to school systems that have not yet considered it. This will open new part-time teaching opportunities to women in areas where these opportunities are not now available.

Anyone interested in Partnership Teaching should contact the Partnership Teaching Program, Women's Educational and Industrial Union, 264 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass. 536-5651

-30-

PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM EVALUATION MEETING FOR PRINCIPALS - December 9, 1965

On Thursday, December 9, 1965 the Partnership Teaching Program held the first evaluation meeting for principals. Attending the meeting were Mr. John Daddona, Principal, Thomas Hill School, Waltham, Mass.; Mr. George King, Director of Elementary Instruction, Framingham, Mass.; Mr. Robert Luther, Principal, South School, Hingham, Mass.; Mr. Timothy Rhodes, Principal, Brooks School, Lincoln, Mass.; Miss Nancy Robinson, Principal, Roosevelt School, Framingham, Mass.; Mr. Joseph Schmidt, Principal, Hastings School, Framingham, Mass.; and Mr. John Stefani, Principal, Norton Elementary School, Norton, Mass. These principals represent five of the eight school systems in which Partnership Teachers have been placed.

The meeting was conducted by Mrs. Nona Porter, Director of the Partnership Teaching Program. A welcoming talk was given by Miss Ruth Bean, Executive Director of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union.

The following is an outline of the proceedings:

I. Partnership (or part-time) Teachers do not pose any problems in arranging school schedules.

A) There has not been a problem in arranging schedules for Partnership Teachers on the elementary level. On the secondary level there was a problem in one school because Partnership Teachers were hired after the schedule had been set. There should not be any complications if the school schedule is planned with Partnership Teaching in mind.

B) A secondary school with a number of Partnership Teachers may find it advantageous to have several classes, at one grade level, in the same subject, going on at the same time.

II. There has not been a problem with unqualified people applying to the schools for part-time positions. It was thought that this might happen once people knew that part-time jobs were available.

III. Partnership (or part-time) Teachers do not weaken professional organizations.

A) Partnership (and part-time) Teachers should join professional organizations or it will hurt the organization.

B) Partnership (and part-time) Teachers should join an organization or they may lose bargaining power and possibly end up in a bad position on the salary scale.

IV. There has not been a high rate of absenteeism among Partnership Teachers. On the contrary, it was felt that their record has been better than the regular teachers because they have been able to substitute for each other.

V. Partnership Teachers do not create significant administrative burdens. In general, the principals felt that the administrative complications are minor and become routine once a principal has become accustomed to the partnership arrangement.

A) The principal has to evaluate an extra teacher.

B) The principal has to get used to the fact that both teachers aren't always available at the time of day when he may want to see them.

C) Whenever possible, the principal should be saved from additional paper work by having the Partnership Teachers combine their records, requisitions, etc.

D) In giving out extra duty, the principal has to consider the partnership as one room and give each teacher an equal share.

VI. Partnership Teachers have been accepted by the rest of the faculty.

A) Generally, the teachers have been easily accepted by the rest of the faculty. Where there have been exceptions it seems to be a matter of individual personality differences or unusual circumstances (such as the remote location of a partnership classroom).

B) One principal stated that the Partnership Teachers work very hard, have high standards, and are a motivating factor for the whole school.

VII. Parental reactions to Partnership Teaching have been favorable. Many parents were notified at the beginning of school and most parents have now met the Partnership Teachers at parent-teacher conferences. There have been no adverse comments.

VIII. There have not been any problems with parent-teacher conferences.

A) Having two evaluations of each child is an advantage.

B) Parents seem to be less sensitive to a critical opinion about their child when it is based on two observations. They are less likely to believe that the opinion is motivated by a personality conflict.

IX. The Partnership Teachers have been able to give each student sufficient extra help.

A) The morning teacher may have a problem scheduling extra help. The principals felt that the morning teacher must be able to return to the school on certain afternoons to give extra help in her subjects. The Program has also stressed this point with the candidates.

B) In some systems a school bus runs early and children can get to school for extra help with the morning teacher before classes begin. Other schools have a special afternoon once a week when the children can get extra help. Both teachers should be present then, if neccessary.

X. Partnership Teachers are co-ordinating and integrating their work successfully.

A) The principals felt that there was excellent communication between the teachers and that their work was well integrated.

B) The principals have not noted any problems in transition. The teachers have worked out the transition period according to their own particular situations and preferences. 1) Some teachers have used the lunch hour, or a period break as the transition period. 2) One partnership has created its own break. 3) In the first grade partnership classroom the teacher leaving doesn't let the children see her in her coat. She just leaves the room quietly as the other teacher takes over.

C) Partnership Teachers have been able to represent each other at faculty meetings.

XI. There have not been any discipline problems noted as a result of Partnership Teaching. In each partnership the teachers seem to be in agreement on matters of discipline.

XII. In practice, increased talents have been available to the schools; e.g., art, music, and French.

XIII. The principals agreed that Partnership Teachers are highly motivated.

XIV. The Partnership Teaching arrangement has given some of the principals new ideas about staff organization.

A) The partnership arrangement is appealing to teachers who are considering letting up on their schedule prior to retirement.

B) Principals have considered the possibility of pairing an experienced, older teacher with an intern.

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL UNION

264 Boylston Street, Boston

Partnership Teaching Program
Mrs. Nona Porter, Director
Telephone: 536-5651
(Home: TR2-2393, Framingham)

FOR RELEASE: Immediately

MEETING HELD FOR PARTNERSHIP TEACHERS

A meeting for Partnership Teachers was held on Saturday, December 4, 1965? at the Women's Educational and Industrial Union. The women who attended the meeting are participating in the new Partnership Teaching Program. This is a pilot program, supported by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Permanent Charity Fund, Inc. (of Boston), in which two teachers share a full-time teaching position. Generally one takes the morning session and the other, the afternoon session. These are women who, because of family commitments, prefer to work part-time. The nine partnerships represented at the meeting are working in the following school systems: Canton, Framingham, Hingham, Lincoln, Newton, Norton, Waltham, and Westford. Six partnerships are teaching at the elementary level and three are teaching at the high school level.

At the meeting the Partnership Teachers discussed their classroom experiences to date. They generally agreed that Partnership Teaching is significantly beneficial to the student and the school system. On the elementary level the Partnership Teachers work closely together in both curriculum planning and student evaluation. They, thereby, offer the students and the school the combined talents of two highly qualified, experienced teachers. In addition, changing teachers at mid-day helps to alleviate the fatigue problem that is common to both teachers and students in the afternoon. Partnership Teachers are often

-more-

able to substitute for each other. This provides a continuity that is never possible in the common substitute situation. On the high school level the students and the school benefit from the skills and talents of two teachers that might otherwise be lost to the profession.

To date all partnerships have been working very successfully and the principals involved are pleased with the high quality of instruction. The Women's Educational and Industrial Union is planning to expand the Program for the 1966-67 school year.

-30-

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL UNION
264 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts

PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM - ORIENTATION - SEPTEMBER 4, 1965

I.	9:00-9:30	1. Coffee 2. Welcome to the Union
	9:30-10:45	3. Partnership Teaching Program re-explained 4. "Problems in the School Today" and how they relate to Partnership Teaching--panel of principals with moderator George King, Director of Elementary Education, Framingham.
II.	10:45-11:00	1. Address to elementary and secondary school Partnership Teachers---"The Problems of Returning to Work"--Dr. Alice Kimball Smith, Director, Radcliffe Seminars, Radcliffe Institute for Independent Study. 2. Evaluative Criteria--The Principals
III.	11:00-12:45	1. The Partnership--purposes, procedures, and problems Elementary School Partners 2. The Partnership--purposes, procedures, and problems Secondary School Partners 3. Evaluative Criteria--The Principals (continued)
IV.	12:45-1:45	LUNCH
V.	1:45-2:45	Reports from Principals and Partnership Teachers
VI.	2:45-open	Optional--Meeting of principals with partners from their own schools to discuss the way in which decisions made in this Orientation relate to each school situation.

ORIENTATION DAY PANEL: Moderator- Mr. George King

Panelists- Mr. John Stefani
Mr. Robert Luther
Mr. Eugene Hayes

Introduction: Mr. George King, Director of Elementary Instruction, Framingham

First Speaker: Mr. John Stefani, Principal, Norton Elementary School, Norton
Topic: "Professional Ethics and How They Relate to Partnership Teaching"

Partnership teachers should follow the same code of ethics that a full time teacher follows and should participate in all phases of professional responsibilities. Partnership teachers should be active in professional organizations and in working with other teachers and lay persons to improve professional standards.

Partnership teachers, in their unique situation, may be able to set an example for other teachers by demonstrating the success of personal cooperation and the sharing of materials in the classroom.

In their relationship with parents, partnership teachers should get to know parents as soon as possible, should encourage parents' participation in school activities, should keep parents informed, and should be discreet in discussing problems with parents.

Partnership teachers should keep accurate records and should be good housekeepers.

Second Speaker: Mr. Robert Luther, Principal, South Elementary School, Hingham
Topic: "Curriculum Problems in the Elementary School Today and How They Relate to Partnership Teaching"

Curriculum problems are a constant and present no special problems for partnership teachers as opposed to full time teachers. Main changes in the curriculum over the past few years have occurred in the modern mathematics programs and in the teaching of reading and spelling. These changes have involved materials and content as well as teaching methods.

The main problem of curriculum development seems to be deciding where to cut the tremendous content becoming available at increasingly lower grades.

The following points were brought up for consideration by the partnership teachers:

1) Enthusiasm for the subject matter, and for learning in general, must be shown to the children. This enthusiasm must be maintained throughout the school year.

2) One of the prime responsibilities of the teacher is to motivate the children.

3) The teacher must possess a high degree of sensitivity and understanding. She should establish rapport with the children early in the year.

4) A continuing process of self-assessment on the part of the teacher is important. It is imperative that the teacher be aware of each child's productivity and capabilities and the impact various teaching methods have on these things.

Third Speaker: Mr. Eugene Hayes, Principal, North Middle School, Westford
Topic: "Communication and How it Relates to Partnership Teaching"

Communication can be generally defined as the images presented by oneself--how people see you, and how you understand and are understood by others. This inevitably involves one's entire system of values. It is important that one avoid the frequent problems of communication which lead to misconception.

Partnership teachers must inter-relate not only with each other, but also with the students, other teachers, parents and the community.

The partners should know each other as well as possible. They should develop a relationship of trust, complete with criticism and questioning. They should be familiar with each other's curriculum and methods of organization. They should work together to establish common rules and regulations which must be communicated to the students.

Partners, although already accepted by the administration, must work toward acceptance by other teachers as full fledged faculty members. Ideas should be shared with co-teachers and at least one partner must attend all faculty meetings.

Partners should be able to work together in evaluating the progress of each child. They should be able to communicate two points of view to the child's parents.

In general, all lines of communication must be kept open.

ORIENTATION DAY MEETING: Principals and Administrators

Present: Mr. George King
Mr. Robert Luther
Mr. John Stefani
Mr. Eugene Hayes
Mr. John Daddona
Dr. Francis McElaney

Criteria to be used in evaluating the Partnership Teaching Program were discussed and the general decisions made were:

1) Evaluative check lists are too limiting.

2) Another administrative meeting will be necessary in December, or before. This meeting should be completely recorded for the Director's benefit.

3) The Partnership Teaching Program should receive copies of evaluation sheets generally used in each of these school systems -- for, we must remember that everything is subject to local situation.

4) Record of comments made to principals and administrators about the partnership should be sent to the Partnership Teaching Program.

5) The Director should make visits during the year to see the partnerships in action -- this information could be utilized in an initial progress report.

The question of parental communication and response was discussed, along with methods of letting people know about the partnership. It was learned that, in most cases, the parents have already been informed. But, it was decided that the suggested letter to parents should also be sent. Other suggestions were:

1) An informal meeting with parents might be held in the beginning of the year.

2) A June meeting might be arranged, with small groups of parents, to evaluate the year.

3) Regular channels of communication will also be informative.

Some partnership problems that should be anticipated are:

1) Extra help problem - there must be communication between partners so that the afternoon person knows who needs extra help in the morning subjects.

2) Parent-teacher conferences - it was decided that both partners should attend parent-teacher conferences.

3) Faculty meetings - it is not necessary for both partners to attend faculty meetings.

4) School faculty - the rest of the faculty must be oriented to the partnership.

5) Substituting - this should not present a problem because the partners seem to be willing to substitute for each other.

It was decided that administrators must distinguish between the success or failure of the partnership and the success or failure of the personnel involved. One must consider the compatibility of the partners themselves. All evaluative material is to be sent back to the Partnership Teaching Program to be used in the future selection of candidates and partnerships.

The partnership should <u>not</u> be singled out -- it should be absorbed into the normal school situation.

ORIENTATION DAY MEETING - Elementary and Secondary School Partners

The meeting of elementary and secondary school partners opened with a talk by Mrs. Alice Kimball Smith titled "The Problems of Returning to Work". Following Mrs. Smith's talk the partners discussed the various challenges and problems of Partnership Teaching, considering some of the specific points that were brought out by the panelists in their talks on ethics, curriculum and communication.

The first topic discussed was ethics in dealing with parents. It was agreed that under no circumstances would one partner discuss the other partner with parents (or anyone else). Parents who wished to discuss a problem would have to make an appointment to meet with both partners. It might be possible for one partner to discuss a child's academic difficulty in her subjects with a parent; but if there were a chance that discussion would lead into the other teacher's area of concern, then both partners would have to be present.

The problem child and methods of discipline were discussed. It was suggested that each partner should take the responsibility for her own disciplinary problems. The morning teacher must either deal with a problem in her own hours or return to be with a child if her discipline involves afternoon or after school work. Various methods of disciplining children were discussed and it was generally felt that a positive rather than a negative approach to discipline was more satisfying for the teacher and the child. Partnership teaching can provide two points of view about the problem child which can lead to a better understanding of his problem and methods of dealing with it. The partners felt that together they should establish rules for general class discipline and that these ground rules should be made clear to the children during the first week of school.

The difficulties of competition and children picking favorites were thought to be a common occurrence that a mature and experienced teacher should be able to overlook.

Communications were discussed, and the major problem considered was how a partner would convey information about morning activities to the afternoon partner and vice-versa. It was decided that each partnership would have to work out a method of communication according to their own schedules. It was generally agreed that an overlap period, allowing daily discussion, would be far more satisfactory than any other method. It was hoped that partners would be constantly aware of the work that was being done in each other's periods and plan lessons that would have consistency and carry through as much as possible from the morning to the afternoon. An additional communications problem discussed was how to introduce the new Partnership Teaching idea to parents and children. To inform parents a meeting could be held at the school during the first few weeks of school so that all questions could be answered at the beginning of the school year. In presenting the idea to the class on the first day it was felt that they should be told it was unique and exciting to have two teachers, but the children should not be made to feel that they were thereby more privileged than the other children in the school.

The problem of extra time was discussed and the conclusions were as follows: Both partners should be present for after hours school responsibilities as much as possible. They should both attend faculty meetings as often as possible unless the school system felt otherwise. They should be together for special school occasions and ventures beyond the classroom and each teacher should give her time for extra help in her subjects. Partners should also substitute for each other whenever possible.

PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM
Women's Educational and Industrial Union
264 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116

SUGGESTIONS FOR PREPARING FOR PARTNERSHIP TEACHERS ON THE EIEMENTARY LEVEL

I. Parents - Send a letter to parents of chilfren in partnership classes. Hold a special meeting to introduce parents to Partnership Teachers. Explain all the advantages, the results of the first year and the schedule.

II. Faculty Relationships - At the very first opportunity; i.e., the first time the faculty meets, introduce the faculty to the Partnership Teachers - explain that they fullfill all the duties of a full-time teacher - that the program is supported by Carnegie - that the purpose of the program is to provide an opportunity for women who want to teach but cannot do so full-time - that the cooperation and support of the faculty would be appreciated.

III. Faculty Meetings - Concensus last year was that it is not necessary for both elementary partners to attend faculty meetings.

IV. Substituting - Partnership Teachers should be allowed the same number of half-day sick leave and personal leave as full-time teachers. We suggest that partners who substitute be paid one-half a substitute's rate.

V. Professional Organizations - One teacher may join (sometimes partners decide to alternate memberships yearly) or both.

VI. Extra Help - Can be given before school by morning partner or her partner may give the extra help needed. If necessary the morning teacher should return to give extra help in the p.m.

VII. Parent Teacher Conferences - Both teachers should be present. They may see them together or one at a time.

VIII. Extra Duties - Principals should avoid giving partnerships any more duties than are ordinarily assigned to a full-time teacher

IX. Teacher Retirement - Teachers working one-half a schedule or more must contribute to Teachers' Retirement after six months. At that point they may join retroactively if they so wish.

PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM
Women's Educational and Industrial Union
264 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116

SUGGESTIONS FOR PREPARING FOR PARTNERSHIP TEACHERS ON THE SECONDARY LEVEL

I. Faculty Relationships - Partnership Teachers do have more difficulty in getting to know the faculty. An introduction at the beginning of the year would be helpful along with an explanation of their duties.

II. Faculty Meetings - Partnership Teachers are expected to attend faculty meetings. Occasionally one partner can represent the other at meetings when appropriate.

III. Contributions - Partnership Teachers receive only a percentage of a full-time salary and should be asked to contribute to funds and charities with this in mind.

IV. Substituting - Partnership Teachers should be allowed one-half the sick leave and one-half the personal leave allowed a full-time teacher. We suggest that partners who substitute be paid one-half a substitutes rate.

V. Professional Organizations - One teacher may join (sometimes partners decide to alternate membership yearly) or both may join.

VI. Extra Help - Partnership Teachers plan to return one day a week for extra help time if necessary.

VII. Parent-Teacher Conferences - Both partners attend all parent-teacher meetings.

VIII. Extra Duties - Principals should avoid giving partnerships any more duties than are ordinarily assigned to a full-time teacher.

IX. Teacher Retirement - Teachers working one-half a schedule or more must contribute to Teachers' Retirement after six months. At that point they may join retroactively if they so wish.

1965?

Women's Educational & Industrial Union
264 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116 KE 6-5651

THE PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM

The proposal outlined below is for an experimental program in which two women teachers working half-time will assume a full-time teaching position. One teacher will handle the morning session and the other, the afternoon session.

There is an untapped supply of former women teachers with excellent training and experience who are now available for teaching. These women may be unable or unwilling to teach full-time because of prior family commitments but may be eager to assume long-term teaching careers on a part-time basis.

Much current popular and academic literature is concerned with the utilization of trained women who can offer part-time service.* Many women return to teaching if they can do so without completely leaving their families. Eventually these women, their skills enhanced by continuous experience, may be available on a full-time basis.

There has always been a shortage of good teachers. Even in the Greater Boston area, where the teacher supply is plentiful, school systems have too little choice among qualified applicants. New possibilities of teacher recruitment will allow greater selection. Any meaningful enlargement of a labor pool generally results in higher quality at the upper levels.

The Partnership Teaching Program offers many advantages. Parent-teachers' conferences can be handled by one teacher, or both teachers may be present for conferences. Such an arrangement makes available to the parents of the elementary school child two perspectives of their child's performance in school.

*see bibliography

The younger elementary school students may have to adjust to more than one teacher; however, elementary students are exposed to many different teachers even in the first grade (the music, art, handwriting, physical education teachers and the principal). The student may have a problem with one or both of the teaching partners, but he runs the same risk with the conventional full-time teacher. Indeed, he may benefit by better relations with one or the other for at least half the school day.

There are other advantages to changing to a new teacher at mid-day. She presents a new viewpoint just as the student may need a more stimulating approach. This may alleviate the fatigue problem which commonly faces both teachers and students in the afternoon hours.

The partnership will discuss students' extra help problems. Since two teachers may offer complementary subject matter preparation each one can offer special assistance in different areas.

The need for substitutes will be reduced since the partner-teacher may be able to take over for a full day. In addition, substitutes for a half-day program may be available in greater numbers than full-time substitutes.

Since there is some inevitable faculty turnover before contract expiration, partnership teaching insures continuity for the students.

Partnership teachers will provide an increased pool of talents and interests for the school as well as an increase in the number of motivated teachers.

The objective of the Partnership Teaching Program is to select two former teachers to assume a full-time teaching position in the elementary and secondary schools. The teachers may divide their labor in the following manner:

8:30 - 12:00
11:30 - 2:30 plus afternoon help time and/or extracurricular activities.

They will spend some time together before the opening of school for planning and coordinating the curriculum. During the school year, they will spend as much time together as is necessary for planning, coordination, and pupil evaluation.

The morning teacher will also be available on occasional afternoons for faculty representation or special educational problems.

Former teachers will be reactivated by a recruiting program through the Women's Educational and Industrial Union in cooperation with an advisory committee composed of representatives from Boston College, Boston University, Northeastern University, Harvard University, The Radcliffe Institute for Independent Study, Simmons College, Tufts University, and the New England School Development Council. They will be screened by the program director, selected and paired according to training, compatibility and geographical location.

Approximately ten partnerships will comprise the pilot group, and they will be paid on a professional salary scale. Each school system will supervise and evaluate its own teachers. The success of the pilot group may be measured in terms of rehiring.

An evaluation of the success of the pilot program will be made at the close of the school year.

Nona Porter, Director

List community activities including offices held: _____

_____

_____

List avocations and hobbies: _____

_____

How do you normally spend your summers? _____

To which locality are you limited? _____

Is a car available for your personal use? _____

Give names of 4 persons acquainted with your teaching ability to whom we may write:

Name _____ Address _____

Name _____ Address _____

Name _____ Address _____

Name _____ Address _____

On a separate sheet answer the following questions:

1. Why do you wish to return to teaching on a part-time basis?
2. How does your family feel about your returning to work?
3. What aspects of teaching did you enjoy most?
4. How did you hear about the Program?
5. When could you teach?
   Morning____ Afternoon____ Either____

Date _____ Signature _____

LIST OF CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF
PARTNERSHIP TEACHING CANDIDATES

1. High academic standing

2. Two years teaching experience preferred

3. Interest and action in community organizations and hobbies

4. Good references from superintendents and/or principals indicating competence as a teacher and sensitivity for children

5. Good physical and emotional health

6. Massachusetts teacher certification or equivalent

7. At least 30 semester hours in subject matter

8. Willingness to arrange hours to fit school needs
   a. Availability to substitute the other half day

9. A positive family attitude towards mother's return to work

10. Adaptability

11. A strong motivation for returning to work
    a. Seriousness
    b. Sureness

12. Professional involvement in field
    a. Recent studies

The interviewer will also bear in mind the following:

Do the public school holidays correspond to those of her family?

How will the applicant handle domestic crises?

How much time can the applicant give to further study?

Will the candidate cooperate with partner and principal?

PARTNERSHIP TEACHING PROGRAM

Principal's EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

I. Administration

A. Is there more bookkeeping involved with partnerships?

1. Only because there is an additional member of the staff.
2. Yes, a little.
3. Very little, except double evaluations.
4. Minimal
5. No
6. There is some additional bookkeeping, but it is a minor consideration.
7. None, other than the fact that you add another person to the total faculty.
8. Yes, - payroll, leave records.
9. No

B. Are there any difficulties in communicating with two teachers?

1. Only because there is an additional member on the staff.
2. Yes
3. No
4. You have to get used to the idea that "before school" and "after school" differ with each of the partnership.
5. No
6. None, in my experience.
7. Can't answer in our situation. Mailboxes are effective.
8. Not really - as long as the two teachers communicate.
9. Not really, sometimes delayed until next day.

C. Are there any scheduling problems because of partnerships?

1. Not really.
2. Yes
3. No
4. Slight - this year the music person was available in the morning- we would rather have had her in the afternoon.
5. No
6. Scheduling problems do arise with regard to special teachers, class trips, testing. These can be worked out to everyone's satisfaction.
7. None
8. None - mutual agreement as to what subjects are taught.
9. No

D. Is there a high rate of absenteeism among Partnership Teachers?

1. Definitely not.
2. No
3. No - lower than rest of teachers.
4. No! - less than average.
5. No
6. No

I. Administration (cont.)

D. 7. Definitely not!
8. Not any more than with other teachers. The sample or number involved is too small to say yes or no. One partner's parents died and increased the loss of time.
9. Not more than most full time teachers.

E. Do you find in practice that increased talents and interests are available to you and the students.
1. Very definitely.
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Potential for such.
6. Yes
7. Yes. In fact, the presence of these two ladies and their ideas has stimulated several faculty members to do and try new ideas.
8. Very definitely. Art, music are very evident. Also special abilities and talents in subject areas. Outside interests, as travel, help enrich - as we have two teachers to travel and read.
9. I believe this to be true more to the pupils.

II. Faculty Reaction

A. Are there additional problems with the faculty because of partnerships? Are they accepted as professionals by the faculty?
1. No additional problems with the faculty that I have noticed. They are accepted as professionals because they both have many years of experience.
2. No problems.
3. Yes
4. No special problems, but the faculty only gets to "see them" one-half as much and thus only knows them one-half as well.
5. In sharing of duties and responsibilities, I feel some faculty members have reservations.
6. No problems. They have been accepted as regular staff.
7. Yes; there was some resentment of the partners' convenient time schedule, but this has disappeared.
8. Yes - no problems here. Comment is that they work harder in combination than the regular teachers.
9. There was no particular reaction. They were accepted on basis of their cooperation and attitude toward school policies.

(cont.)

II. Faculty Reaction (cont.)

B. Do Partnership Teachers tend to weaken professional organizations?

1. Not in this case for both belong and participate.
2. No
3. I feel they should both belong to professional organizations - local, state, and national.
4. Probably, but this would have to be judged over a long period of time and with many partnerships.
5. Not necessarily. I do feel that each should participate as an individual member in professional organizations rather than sharing a membership.
6. No
7. To the contrary, one of our partners served to help stimulate its meetings!
8. Don't think so. It strengthens it as both teachers join professional organizations.
9. I don't think they should if they participate as members.

C. How do they handle attendance at faculty meetings? Are they well represented at meetings?

1. Both attend when necessary and alternate at other times. Always present.
2. Both come.
3. Yes - one attends and reports to the other.
4. Afternoon partner attends meetings.
5. Attendance is shared on alternate weeks if weekly meetings are held. If the agenda necessitates the presence of both teachers, they have always cooperated. The agenda often determines which teacher shall attend.
6. One or both attend all meetings.
7. Not as I would have liked, but there was no problem, really. Our times just conflicted too greatly.
8. One attends and informs the other.
9. They attended faculty meetings if held at the time they were at school. Inservice meetings were attended by all.

III. Parental Reaction

A. Are there any positive or negative reactions on the part of parents to partnerships?

1. All reactions favorable thus far.
2. No
3. Only reaction has been positive.
4. No negative reactions - more than average positive reactions.
5. No more than the regular one teacher classroom.
6. Parents accept this program as they do many others without voicing any real concern, positive or negative.
7. Parents were not really aware of the partnership as a partnership.
8. Being new we used the letter of explanation to the parents. This was of great help.
9. I didn't have any reaction of a negative nature. There were several quite favorable in favor of one partner teacher.

(cont.)

III. Parental Reaction: (cont.)

B. Are there any problems with parent-teachers' conferences?

1. Both attend and this is a definite improvement.
2. No
3. No - both meet with parent.
4. None. Both partners were available for conferences. The new state requirement for a five hour day may put a wrench into this possibility, however.
5. No
6. No. Conferences are arranged for the most part when both partners may be present.
7. None
8. None - both teachers are present.
9. None that I have been made aware of.

C. Are there any advantages to having partnerships conduct parent-teachers' conferences? Do the partners offer two perspectives of the same child to parents?

1. Two views of the child made available - one person may see qualities that another does not.
   Definitely yes - the partners offer two perspectives of the same child to parents.
2. Irrelevant - because we are departmentalized anyway.
3. Yes - pupil is discussed in detail before teachers meet with parent.
4. Yes!
5. Yes to both parts of the question.
6. Yes. The partners have had an opportunity to formulate conference plans and two voices are always stronger than one.
7. Cannot answer.
8. Parents seemed pleased with all of the attention.
9. In my opinion there could be a definite advantage not only by having two perspectives but also a two to one ratio - two teachers to one parent or maybe two to two.

IV. Student Reaction

A. Do students have any difficulty in adjusting to more than one teacher? or to a part-time teacher?

1. No - because of the nature of our program.
2. -
3. No
4. Haven't noticed any.
5. No. Children are very flexible and adjust readily.
6. No
7. No
8. Call teachers' names interchangeably.
9. There wasn't much if any. There was none mentioned to me except one case and that one had the same problem last year with a one teacher situation.

IV. Student reaction (cont.)

B. Do students accept Partnership Teachers as fully professional?

1. Yes
2. Were a little slower to accept them.
3. ?
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Yes
8. Very definitely.
9. I never heard anything either way. I believe our third grade pupils accepted the Partnership Teachers as fully professional.

C. Is late afternoon fatigue relieved by Partnership Teaching.

1. Yes, both on the part of the teacher and student.
2. Probably
3. Not completely - but it helps.
4. Yes
5. No definite indication from students. Teacher fatigue is reduced giving energies for evaluation and planning for the following day's work.
6. This would seem to be a possibility, but is not immediately noticeable
7. Yes!
8. Both are fresh.
9. There has been no comment.

D. Do students benefit from having more than one teacher?

1. Yes, because of the availability of different backgrounds, interests, and strengths of each teacher.
2. Yes
3. Yes - because of varied backgrounds and experiences that teachers have had.
4. Subjectively, yes! - Objectively, the jury is still out.
5. It would appear that the experiences would encompass a wider range depending on the teacher background; however, on their experiences and background.
6. I believe they do, but there is no concrete evidence to support such a belief.
7. -
8. We feel the bringing of two adult personalities with their interests has been of great help.
9. Yes, two personalities and two fields of training and experience tend to bring extra benefits to pupils.

IV. Student reaction (cont.)

E. Do the students receive as much extra help with Partnership Teachers as with a regular full-time teacher?

1. More, because of more time availability.
2. More
3. Yes - as much as with a full-time teacher.
4. About the same.
5. I do not think the children receive any more individual help from a partnership. I think the amount of individual help given students is dependent upon the personality, philosophy and dedication of the individual classroom teacher or teachers as the case may be.
6. Students certainly receive as much extra help and more in some areas.
7. Our teaching partner was not as effective, here, as a full partnership might have been or as a full-time teacher is; this was solved, however, to the degree possible in our situation, by releasing students from other classes.
8. We feel they receive more, as the children that need extra help receive it from both of the teachers. Here, too, the talents of the teachers has been of help in the remedial or extra help.
9. Yes. Extra help is available before class time in the morning by the morning session teacher, at noon by both, and after school by the afternoon session teacher.

V. Partnership Co-operation

A. Is there co-operation between the partners?

1. In this case, it couldn't be better.
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes - a necessity.
5. Yes. There must be in order to insure success. This is a key to the success of such a program.
6. Yes, in my experience.
7. Not appropriate for our partnership.
8. Yes
9. Yes - close cooperation and planning.

B. Is there good communication between the two?

1. In this case, it couldn't be better.
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes - a necessity.
5. Yes. This is a necessity in the daily planning.
6. Yes
7. Not appropriate for our partnership.
8. Yes
9. Yes

V. Partnership Co-operation (cont.)

C. Do they represent one another at faculty meetings?

1. Yes, whenever necessary.
2. No, both come.
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Not appropriate for our partnership.
8. Yes
9. Yes

D. Do they substitute for one another when necessary?

1. Yes
2. No - one in science, the other in math.
3. Yes
4. Only one day missed - other partner was not available that day.
5. Yes. Cooperation in this regard has been outstanding particularly in emergency situations.
6. Yes
7. Not appropriate for our partnership.
8. One of the biggest plus factors of the program.
9. Yes

E. Do the partnerships offer each other and the principal two perspectives of the same child?

1. Definitely
2. Irrelevant
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Not appropriate for our partnership.
8. Very fine - they do complement one another.
9. I'm sure they have, to each other.

F. Do they work well together? Is there more or less or the same amount of correlation between subjects in Partnership Teaching as with a single teacher?

1. Yes, they work well together. Because of the nature of our program I would say at least as much, if not more correlation between subjects.
2. Irrelevant
3. Yes
4. They work well together but I feel that there has to be less correlation with the partnership.
5. They work very well together. I feel that there may be more correlation between subjects in Partnership Teaching due to the great need for constant communication.
6. The partners do work well together, however, there is some difficulty correlating material in different subject areas.

V. Partnership Co-operation (cont.)

F. Do they work well together? Is there more or less or the same amount of correlation between subjects in Partnership Teaching as with a single teacher? (cont.)

7. Not appropriate for our partnership.
8. No problem here. The half hour overlap at lunch time has helped.
9. They seem to be working very well together and I would believe a close correlation between subjects has been maintained.

G. Is there any problem in the transition of one partner to another?

1. No, because the children have been accustomed to it.
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. Not in our situation. The transition has taken care of itself very easily as one teacher brings the class to lunch while the other returns with the class after lunch.
6. No
7. Not appropriate for our partnership.
8. None
9. None that I have had called to my attention.

H. Do partnerships have any discipline problems due to the fact that neither is there for the entire day?

1. No
2. Maybe, the morning teacher cannot easily or often call in a pupil after school.
3. No
4. No
5. No
6. No
7. Not appropriate for our partnership.
8. None. Each handles the problems as they arise.
9. No

VI. General Advantages and Disadvantages

A. Does the departmentalization of subject matter offer any advantages?

1. We were originally organized this way before the advent of Partnership Teaching and therefore feel that there are many advantages.
2. Yes
3. Yes - teachers can better prepare lessons - teach what they are most interested in.
4. Better planning - more concentrated.
5. It allows each teacher to teach in the academic areas which are her interests and strengths.
6. Yes. Partners distribute subject matter according to their strengths.
7. It was a definite advantage in our case - Guidance and Social Studies.
8. Self contained classroom - each teacher takes an area.
9. I think there would be an advantage to concentrating preparation to fewer subject areas, however, this might prove a disadvantage if the teacher places too much emphasis on her subject areas thus causing the pupil difficulty in carrying the load of two teachers.

VI. General Advantages and Disadvantages (cont.)

B. Do the Partnership Teachers seem highly motivated?

1. Yes - probably because of the people involved and their desire to make the program succeed.
2. Yes
3. Yes - very interested in what they are doing.
4. Yes
5. No more so than any outstanding classroom teacher.
6. Yes
7. Very highly motivated. The new ideas, evidence of considerable planning and thought for classes was overwhelming to me.
8. Very much so. They want to please and do a good job - maybe Hawthorne Effect is in operation.
9. I think they are, especially the one.

C. Do two teachers instead of one represent any problems we had not anticipated

1. None - except there is one more on the staff to supervise and account for, etc.
2. No
3. No
4. -
5. To date, we have not met any unforseen problems.
6. No
7. No
8. -
9. Not really. The only one I think of is occasionally when I would like to see one about a matter she is not at school.

D. Do they represent any advantages we had not anticipated?

1. I think we have covered them all, but let me say I am very pleased at this point.
2. I did not know your hopes.
3. Because they have done a very good job they have motivated other teachers to put forth a little additional effort.
4. If one teacher has to leave, the teaching program remains more stable.
5. You seem to have anticipated all the advantages and disadvantages.
6. No
7. Definitely stress to administrators the returns they will get. These teachers work much harder than their half pay rewards them for. From a management point of view, this is a definite asset for the Program.
8. The substituting is one of the great plus factors.
9. They had one distinct advantage recently that I had not anticipated. Both agreed to cooperate by teaching the full day, one substituting for Mr. Riese. This was not intended but it worked out nicely when substitutes were at a premium for the day.